



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,298	07/12/2001	Mark Stephen Webb	30566.155-US-01	3888

55895 7590 11/27/2006

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

BASOM, BLAINE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,298	WEBB, MARK STEPHEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Blaine Basom	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-21 and 23-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-11,13-21 and 23-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

The Examiner acknowledges the Applicant's amendments to claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, and 27. In light of these amendments, the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejections presented in the previous Office Action for claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 21, and 27 are withdrawn.

Regarding independent claims 1, 11, and 21, the Applicant submits that these claims have been amended to recite that the collapsed version of the claimed dialog window comprises a title bar of the dialog window, and that the complete window is only displayed in response to the cursor moving within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window. The Applicant argues that claims 1, 11, and 21 are consequently distinguishable over Janssen (U.S. Patent No. 6,512,529 to Janssen et al.), presented in the previous Office Action, because it is not within the scope of the present invention for the collapsed version of the dialog window to comprise other displayed features in addition to the title bar since the collapsed version of the dialog window comprises the title bar itself, and since the claims explicitly provide that the cursor must move into the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window to display the complete dialog window. The Examiner, however, respectfully disagrees with these arguments.

First, the Examiner respectfully notes that it *is* within the scope of the present invention for the collapsed version of the dialog window to comprise other displayed features in addition to the title bar. For example, claim 1 recites "wherein the collapsed version of the dialog window comprises a title bar of the dialog window" (emphasis added). The terminology, *comprises*, is inclusive and thus entails that other elements may be included within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window (see e.g. MPEP §2111.03). Regardless, Janssen teaches a

Art Unit: 2173

collapsed version of a dialog window that comprises only a title bar of the dialog window, as was described in the previous Office Action (see e.g. pages 2-3 of the Office Action mailed 6/13/2006).

Second, the Examiner respectfully notes that claims do *not* entail that the cursor must move into the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window to display the complete dialog window. For example, claim 1 recites, “displaying the complete dialog window in response to the cursor moving only from outside of the collapsed version of the dialog window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window without depressing a button of the dialog window.” The “only” terminology entails that no further movement of the cursor is required to display the collapsed version of the dialog window; moving the cursor from outside the collapsed version of the dialog window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window causes display of the complete version of the dialog window, without further cursor movement or positioning necessary. And Janssen teaches this feature.

As is more specifically described in the rejections below, Janssen teaches displaying a complete window in response to moving the cursor from outside of an invisible version of the window (considered a “collapsed version”) to anywhere within the extent of the invisible version (for example, see column 2, line 33 – column 3, line 20; and column 4, line 56 – column 5, line 9). Janssen further demonstrates that such an invisible version may comprise a displayed title bar (for example, see column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 4). Since the complete window is displayed in response to moving the cursor from outside of the extent of the invisible window to anywhere within the extent of the invisible window, including its displayed title bar, it is readily apparent that moving the cursor from outside the invisible version of the window to within the

Art Unit: 2173

title bar of the invisible version of the window causes display of the complete version of the window, without further cursor movement or positioning necessary. That is, Janssen teaches displaying the complete window in response to the cursor moving only from outside of the collapsed version of the window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the window, as is claimed.

In addition, the Examiner respectfully notes that the placement of “only” within the phrase is significant to the scope and meaning of the claims. For example, a recitation of “displaying the complete dialog window only in response to the cursor moving from outside of the collapsed version of the dialog window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window” requires the cursor to be moved into the title bar in order for the complete version of the window to be displayed. However, “displaying the complete dialog window in response to the cursor moving only from outside of the collapsed version of the dialog window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window” – as is currently recited – entails displaying the complete dialog window in response to moving the cursor into the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window, without any further movement, but does not require that such cursor movement be the only way to bring about the collapsed version of the window. That is, it is within the scope of the claim for other cursor movements (i.e. moving the cursor anywhere within the extent of the collapsed version of the dialog window, as Janssen teaches) to bring about the dialog window.

Regarding dependent claim 7, the Applicant argues that Janssen teaches away from changing the focus to another window, as is claimed, since Janssen does not describe windows which require user input, and since positioning a cursor in a portion of such a window covered

Art Unit: 2173

by a collapsed (i.e. invisible) window would cause the collapsed window to reappear, and thus prohibit input into the covered window. In response, the Examiner respectfully submits that the Applicant's arguments ignore the fact that the U.S. Patent of Wandersleben (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,390 to Wandersleben et al.) was also applied in the previous Office Action to reject claim 7 (see e.g. pages 5 and 12-13 of the Office Action mailed 6/13/2006). That is, implementing the collapsible windows of Janssen within an application like that of Wandersleben, which requires input in windows covered by dialog boxes, is applicable to a teaching of reverting focus to an underlying window (e.g. Word). The Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 7 are thus moot in view of the grounds of rejection applied, but not considered by the Applicant.

Moreover, and for the sake of argument, the Examiner again respectfully asserts that the radar implementation described by Janssen is merely an example, and it is understood that the teachings of Janssen may be implemented in a plurality of environments, including those where background or other windows require user interaction. Such applications are notoriously well known in the art. Also, in response to the Applicant's arguments that positioning a cursor in a portion of a window covered by a collapsed (i.e. invisible) window would cause the collapsed window to reappear, the Examiner respectfully submits that the user often times would not need to position the cursor in the window. That is, there are other methods in which a user could work in such a window (e.g. keyboard input) which would not result in the collapsed window reappearing and covering the user's work. The Applicant's argument is irrelevant regarding such cases.

Further regarding claim 7, the Applicant argues that there would be no motivation to combine Janssen with Word (Microsoft Word 2000) as done in the previous Office Action. The

Examiner, however, respectfully disagrees. Word clearly demonstrates the advantages of automatically reverting focus to a background window when a window covering the background window is collapsed: the user is more efficiently able to input information into the background window, since he or she does not need to select the background window to bring it into focus and allow to user to enter information into the window (e.g. text via keyboard input). Such a teaching is directly applicable to Janssen and Wandersleben.

Applicant's arguments have therefore been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 13-16, 19, 21, 23-26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,512,529, which is attributed to Janssen et al. (and hereafter referred to as "Janssen"). In general, Janssen provides a method for viewing a high volume of information within a computer display screen. This method entails viewing information organized within a plurality of windows, with windows overlapping other windows, whereby the user may designate particular windows to be invisible, in order to view information within overlapped windows (see column 2, line 29 – column 2, line 31). It is understood that the

types of such windows are arbitrary, and may therefore comprise dialog windows, a common and well-known window type.

Specifically regarding claims 1, 11, and 21, Janssen teaches: displaying a window of a currently active application on a display device; determining a location of a cursor with respect to the window; making the window, or portions thereof, invisible in response to moving the cursor from within the window to outside of the window without depressing a button of the window; and displaying the complete window again in response to moving the cursor from outside of the invisible window to within the extent of the invisible window without depressing a button of the window (for example, see column 2, line 33 – column 3, line 20; column 4, line 56 – column 5, line 9). Janssen further teaches that, instead of making the entire window invisible, only a title bar of the window may be displayed (for example, see column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 4). Such a displayed window, only comprising a title bar, is considered a collapsed version of the window like claimed. Moreover, as Janssen discloses that the complete window is displayed in response to moving the cursor from outside of the invisible window to anywhere within the invisible window (e.g. its title bar) – and that no further movement or positioning of the cursor is required – Janssen further teaches displaying the complete window in response to the cursor moving *only* from outside of the collapsed version of the window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the window without pressing a button of the window. As asserted above, it is understood that such teachings may apply to dialog windows, a well-known type of window in the art. Accordingly, Janssen teaches a computer-implemented method for collapsing a dialog window of an application, the method comprising: displaying a complete dialog window of a currently active application on a display device; determining a location of a cursor with

respect to the dialog window; displaying a collapsed version of the dialog window in response to the cursor moving from within the complete dialog window to outside of the complete dialog window without depressing a button of the dialog window, wherein the display of the collapsed version of the dialog window consumes a smaller area of the display device than the complete dialog window and wherein the collapsed version of the dialog window comprises a title bar of the dialog window; and displaying the complete dialog window in response to the cursor moving only from outside of the collapsed version of the dialog window to within the title bar of the collapsed version of the dialog window without depressing a button of the dialog window, like recited in claim 1. Janssen further discloses that such teachings may be implemented as software, presumably stored in computer memory and executed by a computer (see column 4, lines 5-40). Such computer memory comprising software to implement the teachings of Janssen is considered an “article of manufacture,” like described in claim 11. A computer executing the software in order to implement the teachings of Janssen is considered a system like that described in claim 21.

Concerning claims 3, 5, 13, 15, 23, and 25, Janssen teaches that the collapsed version of the may comprise only a title bar of the window (for example, see column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 4). As shown in figure 3 of Janssen, for example, such a title bar may comprise a size that exactly encompasses a title of the dialog window and its system buttons (see the title bar, designated by reference number 11 in figure 3). It is understood that the title bar is displayed in the same position when the window is collapsed (for example, see figures 2-4, and their associated description in column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 9). Accordingly, Janssen teaches that the collapsed version of the window may be displayed such that system buttons, within the

title bar of the window, are in the same position in the collapsed version of the window as when the complete window is displayed, wherein the system buttons do not move away from the cursor when the window collapsed or expands.

With respect to claims 4, 6, 14, 16, 24, and 26, Janssen discloses that the user may make a window invisible, i.e. collapsed, simply by moving a cursor off the window, and may make the window visible again simply by moving the cursor over the collapsed version of the window (for example, see column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 20; column 4, line 56 – column 5, line 9).

Accordingly, it is understood that the collapsed version of the window is displayed in response to the cursor moving outside of the window without additional action by the user, and the complete window is displayed when the cursor moves within the collapsed version of the window without additional action by the user.

Regarding claims 9, 19, and 29, Janssen discloses that the title bar of each window may comprise a button which may be activated to select a particular display mode for the window. In one such display mode, referred to as the “Normal” display mode, the associated window behaves as described above: the window collapses when the cursor is moved off the window, and becomes visible when the cursor moves over the collapsed version of the window (see column 3 lines 5-29; and column 5, lines 9-48). In another display mode, referred to as the “Locked” display mode, the associated window always remains visible, as a complete window (see column 3 lines 5-29; and column 5, lines 9-48). Accordingly, Janssen teaches that the ability to display a collapsed version of a window is controlled by a selectable system icon displayed in a title bar of that window: when the selectable system icon is selected as active, i.e. in a Normal display mode, the ability to display a collapsed version of the window through further cursor movement

Art Unit: 2173

without depressing a button of the window is active; and when the selectable system icon is not selected and is inactive, i.e. in a Locked display mode, the complete window is displayed and the ability to collapse the dialog window through further cursor movement without depressing a button of the window is disabled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 10, 18, 20, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The U.S. Patent of Janssen, which is described above, and also over U.S. Patent No. 6,583,390, which is attributed to Wandersleben et al. (and hereafter referred to as "Wandersleben"). As described above, Janssen teaches a method like that of claim 1, an article of manufacture like that of claim 11, and a system like that of claim 21, whereby the user may collapse a dialog window simply by moving a cursor off of the window. Janssen, however, does not explicitly disclose that the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed when the cursor moves outside of the dialog window for a defined minimum time period, defined by an application that displays the dialog window, as is expressed in claims 8, 18, and 28. Also, Janssen also does not explicitly disclose that the dialog window is a modeless dialog window, as is recited in claims 10, 20, and 30.

Like Janssen, Wandersleben presents a method similar to that of claim 1, whereby a user may collapse a dialog window simply by moving a cursor off of the window (for example, see column 2, lines 20-49). Regarding the claimed invention, Wandersleben discloses that the user may specify a grace period defining the amount of time required for the cursor to be off of the window, before the window collapses (for example, see column 5, lines 33-51; and column 6, lines 30-57). Additionally, Wandersleben discloses that such teachings may be applied to non-model, i.e. modeless dialog windows (for example, see column 2, lines 20-49).

It would have therefore been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Janssen and Wandersleben before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of Janssen such that the user may define a grace period, like taught by Wandersleben, as this would prevent the user from inadvertently collapsing dialog boxes, as is demonstrated by Wandersleben. Additionally, it would have been obvious to apply the method of Janssen to modeless dialog boxes, like taught by Wandersleben, because there exists a need to temporarily hide such modeless dialog boxes, as is taught by Wandersleben.

Claims 7, 17, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Janssen and Wandersleben, which is described above, and also over the Microsoft Word 2000 application, presented in a previous Office Action. As described above, Janssen teaches a method like that of claim 1, an article of manufacture like that of claim 11, and a system like that of claim 21, whereby the user may collapse a dialog window by simply moving a cursor off of the window. Wandersleben teaches that such methods may be implemented with non-modal dialog boxes, to hide the dialog boxes from view, in order to *work*

within a window displayed under the dialog box (for example, see column 2, lines 9-33; and column 4, lines 22-50). Neither Janssen nor Wandersleben, however, explicitly discloses that the focus is reverted to the underlying window without additional action by the user when the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed, as is recited in claims 7, 17, and 27.

Nevertheless such functionality is well known in the art. For example, screenshot 2 of Word shows a dialog box open in Word, and screenshot 3 is the result of minimizing the dialog box of screenshot 2. No further action was taken, and it is clear that the displayed window, Document 1, of Word has focus as evidenced by the depressed representation in the taskbar and that the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed (the rightmost application displayed in the taskbar is screenshot 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to automatically revert focus to another window of the currently active application of Janssen when the collapsed version of the dialog window is displayed, as is taught by Word, in order to eliminate the need to click on the window to restore focus.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated any new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2173

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blaine Basom whose telephone number is (571) 272-4044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bth
11/21/2006

TADESSE HAILU
Patent Examiner
